

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 15-17 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nonogaki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,625,478). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Independent Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended to change the term "image capture means" to "camera". Independent Claim 12 includes the term "camera".

The Examiner has stated that Nonogaki discloses a mobile terminal comprising a camera that captures an image (Figure 1 and item 200, column 4, lines 10-14). Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation of Nonogaki.

Nonogaki discloses an AV processing block 200 which is not a camera. Nowhere in Nonogaki does it disclose, teach or even suggest a camera. The item 200 in Nonogaki is an AV processing block which processes either audio or video. The processing block 200 receives its data from video data memory 203 (column 7, lines 11, 12) or from audio data memory 204 (column 6, lines 64-66). Nonogaki is silent as to how this audio and video data is provided to memories 203 and 204.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1, 7 and 8, as amended, and Claim 12, as pending, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13 and 14, which ultimately depend from Claims 1, 7, 8 or 12, are also believed to

patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 15-17 are dependent claims that define a single CPU. None of the cited references teaches that the single CPU carries out the standby operation for monitoring the incoming call and the image processing operation for processing the image captured by the camera. That is, in Nonogaki, there are provide two CPUs 201, 301. The CPU 201 processes the video or image, and the CPU 301 processes the phone call.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg